UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,574 11/30/2005		Carl Binding	CH920020024US1	7879
54856 LOUIS PAUL I	7590 09/22/200 HERZBERG	8	EXAMINER	
3 CLOVERDA MONSEY, NY	LE LANE		SMITH, CREIGHTON H	
WIONSET, INT	10932		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/535,574	BINDING ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Creighton H. Smith	2614		

	Creighton H. Smith	2614				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>03 SEP '08</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLIC	CATION IN CONDITION FOR ALL	OWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (the MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FILE	n. .ED WITHIN TWO			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the slaset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on tened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS		91 t b ( t b -				
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further con</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> <li>They are not deemed to place the application in bett</li> </ol>	sideration and/or search (see NOī v);	ΓE below);				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	t canceling the			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	rercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a			
10. ☑ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatior REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•				
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but		condition for allowand	ce because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
17 SEP '08	/Creighton H Smith/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2614				

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant's request to withdraw the final rejection will not be granted because the office action of 21 MAR '08 and applicant's preliminary amendment of 4/1/08 did not cross in the mail. examiner disagrees with applicant's argument that Willars is apparently not concerned with an external network control unit that manages network resources for wireless devices. Willars specifically discloses in col. 5, lines 25 et seq. that "a determination is first made...by the control node. Then in line 33 et seq. of col. 5 Willars discloses that a message is sent to the user equipment, by the control node in accordance with the determination, that includes a list of cells. In lines 39 et seq. Willars discloses that the nodes disclose the actions of determing the areas allowed for the user equipment, and preparing a list of cells of those allowed areas. In col. 6, lines 1 et seq. Willars discloses that the control node consults a table maintained at the network control node. Therefore, Willars does disclose that they are concerned with an external network control unit that manages resources for wireless devices. Reagarding applicant's argumnets that Willars is not concerned with enabling a communications device to "vertically handover" a communication channel, this language is not in applicant's claim.

For applicant to properly argue the 103 rejection, applicant's attention is called to the most recent USSC decision of KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. where the Court stated that "a combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results." The Court also held that "granting patent protection to advances that would occur in the ordinary course without real innovation retards progress and may, for patents combining previously known elements, deprive prior inventions of their value or utility. The Court further held, citing Sakraida v. AG Pro, Inc., 425 U.S. 273 (1976), when a patent simply arranges old elements with each performing the same function it had been known to perform and yields no more than one would expect from such an arrangement, the combination is obvious."